



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the church, was not religious, but political." At all events, he regarded the formation of a confessional party as a direct challenge, and he met it by open war.

From the first movement in the long struggle, the abolition of the Catholic Section in the Department of Public Worship, through all the subsequent measures of repression—the "Falk Laws", the law abolishing Church grants, and the so-called "Cloister Laws"—Bismarck found himself confronted by a steadily growing "Centrum".

"The great mistake which the State made was in the choice of its weapons." The "Falk Laws" proved in practice quite incapable of accomplishing their ends. It was also a tactical error to concentrate opposition on the part of the Poles and Nationalists and to unite them with the whole body of German Catholics.

Seeing the weakness of drastic legislation and being relieved from the tension by the removal of Falk and the accession of Leo XIII., Bismarck began to prepare for peace. This was made the more imperative by a shifting of the attitude of Bismarck's allies in the Reichstag. One by one the harsh measures were rescinded, and ultimately Bismarck was forced to apply to his old enemies, the Clericals, for assistance in carrying out measures desired by the government. He had reached "Canossa".

In spite of unavoidable immaturity, the little book is well worth reading, and in view of the conditions under which it was written, it is a quite remarkable production.

Contemporary France. By GABRIEL HANOTAUX. Translated from the French by E. SPARVEL-BAYLY. Volume IV., 1877-1882. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons; London: Archibald Constable and Company. 1909. Pp. xii, 658.)

IN his concluding volume M. Hanotaux begins with the morrow of the dismissal of Jules Simon on May 16, 1877, and ends with the death of Gambetta, December 31, 1882. The latter event he regards as marking the close of "the heroic age" of the Third Republic. The correctness of the date may well be challenged. The term "heroic age" is appropriate for the period in which the Republicans were forced to struggle against tremendous obstacles to bring about the establishment of a genuinely Republican régime. But that period ended earlier than the death of Gambetta. It was over by the time the Republicans had gained control over all departments of the government. It certainly should not be made to include the time when miserable personal rivalries wrecked the long anticipated and much desired Gambetta administration. The mistake seems to have come because the author has been controlled by personal interest and literary canons rather than historical considerations. As in each of the preceding volumes, he has a hero, Gambetta in this instance, and he feels impelled to continue the story until the disappearance of his hero.

The narrative rests upon a considerable but not exceptionally large amount of research. The memoirs of Shuvalov and of Carathéodory Pacha upon the Congress of Berlin, those of M. de Courcel upon the affair of Tunis, and a few letters of General Le Flô constitute the unpublished materials utilized. Newspapers have been used but sparingly. The chief reliance has been upon official publications, the reviews, biographies, and especially memoirs. The use of memoirs has been too extensive and sometimes rather uncritical, little attempt being made to control them by strictly contemporaneous evidence.

In general the brilliant and substantial qualities of the earlier volumes have been fully maintained in this one. To the reviewer, perhaps because of high anticipations, the chief disappointments are the chapters upon the Congress of Berlin and the Gambetta ministry. The former, though containing many interesting details and much shrewd comment, adds nothing of importance to what was already known upon the subject. The latter fails to afford any more satisfactory replies than those we already had to the questions why Gambetta did not succeed in forming the grand ministry and why his administration was so speedily overthrown.

The rendering of the volume into English is badly done, despite a certain smoothness of style. Several usually reliable American reviewers who have commented upon it favorably must have neglected to examine the original. All of the defects noted in my review of the third volume (this journal XIII. 589) are here repeated, but in still greater measure. The English version is a condensation. It omits the preface, a majority of the citations and notes, and contains about 140 pages less than the original, the pages being of almost exactly the same size. In the first five-sixths of the book considerable condensation is secured by freely dropping out on almost every page a few words, clauses, or sentences which the translator appears to regard as superfluous. The last sixth has been reduced by over a half. The result is that the English version omits much which the reader ought to have and yet includes a good deal of unnecessary detail. More serious still is the mistaken or imperfect translation of the remainder. Downright mistakes may be found in great numbers, while vague and imperfect renderings of passages which are clear and definite in the original are still more numerous. The translator displays amazing lack of familiarity with French, English, and American political terms and practices. A flagrant but typical instance occurs on page 631 where Gambetta's proposition of January 14, 1882, for the partial revision of the constitutional laws is given. Having never understood the precise meaning of the term *sénateurs inamovibles*, he translates a caption as a proposition and makes Gambetta advocate the extension of a practice which he was seeking to abolish. This is done although his own translation of the next sentence ought to show him the impossibility of the thing. In the same document a proposal to abrogate the article in the constitutional

laws which provided for the offering of prayers for the Republic on certain occasions receives the following remarkable translation: "The powers of the Senate as to public petitions should be abridged."

FRANK MALOY ANDERSON.

A History of the Irish Parliamentary Party. By F. HUGH O'DONNELL, M.A., Q.U.I. Volume I. *Butt and Parnell: Nationhood and Anarchy. The Curse of the American Money.* Volume II. *Parnell and the Lieutenants, Complicity and Betrayal, with an Epilogue to the Present Day.* (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1910. Pp. xv, 508; xi, 494.)

REVIEW by quotation is seldom desirable. Quotation is, however, far better than any attempt to describe Mr. O'Donnell's *History of the Irish Parliamentary Party*, or any attempt to criticize it or place it in its class. Two extracts will serve to illustrate the style and also the spirit of self-glorification in which Mr. O'Donnell has gone about his work, especially when he is concerned with the part he played while he was of the Home Rule group in the House of Commons from 1877 to 1885. Mr. O'Donnell was elected for Galway in 1874 and was unseated on petition. In January, 1877, he was elected for Dungarvan, and represented that constituency until the dissolution of the Parliament of 1880-1885. Parnell and Biggar were of the House of Commons and of the Nationalist group at Westminster when Mr. O'Donnell rejoined it early in 1877. Mr. O'Donnell claims both Parnell and Biggar as his "apprentices", and asserts that "neither the one nor the other at the outset could move an inch without my guidance, nor utter a criticism without my inspiration." This may be true or otherwise. Its truth is not material here; but what is material as showing the style and spirit and as indicating the usefulness of this history of the Irish Parliamentary party, is Mr. O'Donnell's description of his attitude towards his "apprentices".

"My apprentices felt", he writes, "that they could not even apply the lessons of the master without his personal presence and direction. They helped to quicken my appearance or return upon that scene where—as I had been the first to teach—the intervention of Irish members in English affairs could bring home the importance of Home Rule to every statesman in England. Why? They were neither kinsmen nor comrades of mine. There were a hundred Parliamentarians who were infinitely closer and nearer to them in every respect than I. Except in relation to his labors for my policy Mr. Biggar was a total stranger to me and I to him. I knew absolutely nothing and cared less about Mr. Parnell before I recruited the well-born malcontent for my views and for my views only. Outside of the furtherance of my policy it